REMARKS

Double Patenting Rejection

The pending claims are rejected on grounds of nonstatutory double patenting over US Patent No. 6,691,111. This rejection is overcome with the accompanying Terminal Disclaimer.

35 USC 112 Rejection

The pending claims are rejected under 35 USC 112 over a limitation appearing in all three independent claims, of method steps being performed "without the user having entered a delimiter denoting an end to entry of the abbreviated textual command." The Examiner indicates that this limitation is not explicitly supported in the specification. In response, Applicants note that this limitation is implicitly supported in the specification on p. 8 and the related flow chart of Fig. 6. However, to facilitate prosecution of this application, this limitation is herein removed from the claims.

Independent Claim 2

Claim 2 is rejected over Beauregard et al in view of Snapper et al and Laursen et al[1]. This rejection is in error, because these references, even in combination, fail to disclose all the limitations claim 2. This is explained as follows:

Claim 2 recites receiving an abbreviated text command entered by a user. Claim 2 includes a limitation not suggested by the references, of displaying a list of probable complete commands WHILE receiving the abbreviated command instead of waiting until after the entire abbreviated command is received.

In contrast, Beauregard displays probable commands only AFTER the abbreviated command is completely received. In Beauregard, completion of the command is indicated by the user entering a delimiter such as a punctuation mark (col. 9, line 9).

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to modify Beauregard's displaying step to occur WHILE the command is being received, as taught by Snapper, to arrive at claim 2.

---

[1] The Examiner cites the Laursen reference merely to teach the limitation of "portable device".

However, Snapper does not teach displaying probable **commands** while the user enters a command string; in fact, Snapper is irrelevant to entering commands. Snapper instead teaches displaying probable **personal information** while the user enters personal information. Specifically, Snapper (col. 7, lines 3-19) relates to websites that prompt the user to enter personal information such as the user's name (or address or phone number). WHILE the user enters his name in response to the website's "NAME" query, Snapper's web browser displays to the user a list of names that the user previously entered in response to a "NAME" query on other websites.

Snapper's teaching (of displaying suggested **names** WHILE the user enters his name) would not motivate the skilled person to modify Beauregard's display of probable **commands** to occur WHILE the user enters an abbreviated command to arrive at claim 2. That is because the user would consider doing so to be uncalled-for in Beauregard's application and unlikely to succeed, for the following five reasons: 1) In Snapper, the text being entered is the user's personal information, whereas in Beauregard, the text is a computer command. 2) In Snapper, the text is entered in response to a website's query, whereas in Beauregard, the text is entered on the user's own volition. 3) In Snapper, the type of data being entered is pre-defined (for example, pre-defined to be a name in response a "NAME" query). Whereas in Beauregard, the text is a command to perform any function or application that the computer supports. 4) In Snapper, the user must start out entering an **un**abbreviated version of the text before the computer displays text suggestions. Whereas in Beauregard, the user's text command can be abbreviated (such as "msw" for Microsoft Word) or unabbreviated. 5) In Snapper, the browser can reasonably assume that the user intends to respond to the website's query for "NAME" with the same answer that he previously gave for a "NAME" query. In contrast, such an assumption is irrelevant to Beauregard's application where the commands are entered free-form and not in response to a question. For these reasons, Snapper's teaching (of displaying probable **names** WHILE the user enters his name) would not suggest modifying Beauregard's display of **commands** to occur WHILE the user enters an abbreviated command to arrive at claim 2.

Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claims 37 and 45

Like claim 2 discussed above, claims 37 and 48 are rejected over Beauregard, Snapper and Laursen. However, claims 37 and 48 are patentable over these references for reasons similar to those presented above for claim 2, as follows:

Both claims 37 and 48 recite comparing a command text string to stored commands to determine a probable command. As with the displaying step of claim 2, the comparing steps of claim 37 and 48 are performed WHILE receiving the text string and BEFORE the entire text string has been entered, so that only a partially received portion of the text string is available to be compared.

In contrast, Beauregard's comparing step is performed only AFTER the command is completely entered as indicated by the user entering a delimiter.

The differences between Beauregard and claims 37 and 48 are not made up by the teaching of Snapper. That is because Snapper does not teach comparing a partially-received **command** to determine a probable command. In fact, Snapper is irrelevant to processing commands as explained above. Snapper instead teaches comparing partially-received **name** (or other personal information) entered in response to a "NAME" query to previously-stored names to obtain probable names. Snapper's disclosure of performing a **name**-comparing step WHILE a name is being entered would not motivate the skilled person to modify Beauregard's **command**-comparing step (of comparing a partially-received command to previously-stored commands to determine probable commands) to occur WHILE a command is being entered to arrive at claim 37 or 48. That is because the user would consider doing so to be uncalled-for in Beauregard's application and unlikely to succeed, for the five reasons listed above with reference to claim 2. Therefore, claims 37 and 48 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 3-13, 38-45 and 49-50

The remaining claims all depend from base claims that are explained above to be patentable over the prior art. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 10/24/07